

REMARKS

The first set of claims pertains to a full desk with adjacent furniture components on at least one side of the corner section; the second group pertains to the corner section per se and the third group is for the full desk with adjacent components on both sides.

The Examiner has cited the Grubb reference and has combined it with a plethora of other references in an attempt to come up with applicant's ergonomically correct space saving desk. To further enhance the patentability, feature has been added and the number of claims reduced to help the Examiner pinpoint the invention. While Grubb has the general configuration of the work surface, the keyboard area is different in that it appears to be a fixed board s is a apparent from a close review of figure 1. Thus his keyboard neither moves in or out as per claim 14 or is infinitely adjustable per claim 33.

The piling on of additional references to achieve the ergonomic desk of applicant is in part hindsight on the part of the Examiner. Sooner or later, all of the individual so called obvious modifications pile up such that a level of invention is seen to exist in something no one else has done. Novikoff does not have the ergonomic keyboard either, nor does he have a complete electrical/data termination center with or without wire management. His unit is glued together so no changes can be made. Applicant can use any adjacent furniture component if properly configured.

The Brown patent has a keyboard which is not adjustable and is not inset. A worker does not have the correct focal depth distance when using it, and of of course no mouse space is provided. The Brown patent is for a folding table with a surge protector. This is not as friendly an environment as the Examiner makes it out to be . The keyboard is narrow as is readily seen, and one hole in the rear of a work surface does not a wire management system make.

Novikoff has a flat multi-sectioned work surface unit with no keyboard holder disposed anywhere. One is supposed to use the work surface to hold the keyboard. Plus the shape of the corner differs from that of Applicant and differs from Grubb who has a 3 part pedestal for the corner section as opposed to the two part pedestal of applicant. Sure Novikoffff has a trough for wires, but the mode of having same does not permit any adjacent furniture component to be a book case or cabinet. It is inherently impossible.

It is believed that Novikoff cannot be the lead reference because he has a flat table. No provision is made for any kind of keyboard. And should one place a keyboard underneath the Novikoff structure it is still not an inset keyboard due to the construction of Novikoff. Unfortunately, the Examiner is not correct as to his description of Novikoff's figure 20. It lacks

1 a great deal and the attempt to fill in from other patents fails as well.

2 The Examiner over simplifies in his attempts to find the invention via hindsight. What
3 he says is obvious to combine the teachings of "A" with "B", simply "ain't so". The structure
4 of Brown and Novikof do not permit these simple insertions of technology to be made. For
5 example the insertion of FICH at page 7 line 6 is simply not true as he asserts. Please reread.

6 The bit about the 14 to 16 inch side edges being obvious is again an over-simplification.
7 Special calculations were made to permit the use of a large keyboard, and this measurement was
8 the basis for calculating the sizing of the adjacent furniture components, and the 14"-16"
9 dimensions.

10 In paragraph 9, the Examiner starts off with Novikoff being modified and goes from there.
11 The problem is getting to Novikoff from the get go. The "as modified Novikoff" is based on
12 false assumptions in the first place. So how can Simonton be added to a false assumption??? It
13 is clearly not obvious to go from a U-shaped flat desk of Novikoff to achieve the product of
14 applicant.

15 The desk of applicant is a commercial product that sells well in the high end market
16 because executives want the features and ergonomics of the desk of applicant for health safety
17 reasons. The inset keyboard allows better use of the real estate of the work surface and the wires
18 are hidden away because executives don't want clutter. Yet the spacing of the desk to the wall is
19 aesthetically pleasing due to the recessed rear wall.

20 Counsel has attempted to simplify the claims and to group them to aid the Examiner in his
21 review of this very important advance in the field of computer desks.

22 Counsel is not wedded to any specific wording in the claims and is willing to work with
23 the Examiner to obtain allowable subject matter. Thus an Examiner initiated phone call to the
24 undersigned is requested to further hasten prosecution. Counsel can be reached in California at
25 916-485-5000.

26
27 Respectfully submitted,

28
29
30 
Mark C. Jacobs, 24043

31 Attorney for Applicant(s)

32 sactopat@aol.com
33
34